

FREE CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Volume I.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY AUGUST 9, 1866.

Number 45

The "Dead Letter" Men Condemned.

In a former issue, we published copious extracts from the "Presbyter" of July 18, going to show that, according to the opinion of Dr. Monfort, Drs. Humphrey and Smith were misrepresenting the action of the Assembly, in stating that the unconstitutional orders of the Assembly of 1865, were a "dead letter," and were so regarded generally; and that even the Assembly of 1866, so construed them. Whether Drs. Humphrey and Smith so believe, in view of the documentary evidence to the contrary, is not for us to say.

The "Presbyterian Banner" of August 1st, has an article upon the same subject, in which it fully endorses Dr. Monfort's interpretation of the action and spirit of the Assembly, and takes to task rather severely these "dead letter" men, for intimating that the Assembly does not mean what it says. The "Banner" says:

"The whole effect of such reasoning as this is merely to endeavor to assure hearers and readers that the Assembly did not mean what it said in 1865, and repeated in 1866, what it had done the year before." It goes on to say:

"Nothing could be wider of the mark; and how Dr. Smith could have given such an interpretation to the proceedings of the Assembly is passing strange."

"Equally unfounded is the assertion that the Assembly of 1866, regarded the action of 1865 as a 'dead letter.' But on the contrary, the Assembly of 1866 said the very reverse. The Memorial of the Convention, which was approved by the Assembly, urged upon the Assembly that, instead of its past deliverances being treated as a 'dead letter,' the Assembly has nothing to change, explain, modify, take back, or amend."

Now we presume, that no one will dare to deny, that these two papers represent much more correctly the mind of the majority of that Assembly than any of the other papers in the country; and that they are in perfect sympathy with the radical leaders of that body. And they do not hesitate to charge Drs. Humphrey and Smith with misrepresenting the acts, spirit and intent of that Assembly.

The question arises then: why should Drs. Humphrey and Smith, in their speeches before the people misrepresent the action of the Assembly, and claim for it to have done what it took such special pains to affirm that it had not done? We can offer no other reason than that they are using their "strategic" powers in order to deceive the people of the border States, and lead them to still further acquiescence in these unconstitutional measures of the Assembly, until it shall have tied them hand and foot. And to a certain extent this "strategy" has already proved successful. The common people, instead of ascertaining for themselves, by a careful reading of the published proceedings of the Assembly, listen to the statements of these "strategists," and from their former high standing and position in the Church, they credulously receive their statements as true. Hence the cry of even good people is still "wait!" "wait!" and as these orders and deliverances are only a "dead letter" and are not to be obeyed or enforced; perhaps the next Assembly will altogether repudiate these unconstitutional acts, and save us from protesting in this positive manner!

That the people should be influenced by such "strategy" is the more remarkable, when the actions of Drs. Humphrey and Smith are so diametrically in opposition to their assertions. We speak now with special reference to Dr. Humphrey. For while he is trying to persuade the people of Kentucky that these unconstitutional and unscriptural acts are a "dead letter," and nobody obeys them, he is urging upon the "Assembly's Presbytery of Louisville" to execute these very "dead letter" orders, and with singular effrontery to issue and execute other orders which are much more oppressive to his brethren, and equally as unconstitutional as those which he pronounces a "dead letter."

If the Presbyterian people of Kentucky can not see through such "strategy" as this, we despair of their comprehending the danger with which the Church is threatened by the majority of four-to-one who ruled in the last Assembly; or, at least, that they will not see it until it shall be too late. And yet to our mind the case is so plain a one that it looks like an insult to the common sense of the Presbyterians of Kentucky, to argue so plain a proposition, to wit: that the Assembly is determined to drive from it all those who stand up boldly for the doctrines of the Church as a spiritual Commonwealth, or who will not quietly submit to the arbitrary acts of the majority of four-to-one.

We venture this prediction, that, if the real Presbyterian people of Kentucky fail to act like men in this crisis, then, in much less time than many of them have been in finding out that our former predictions have been fully verified, all we now predict in regard to the

designs of the General Assembly will be literally fulfilled. "We speak as to wise men, judge ye what we say."

Rev. Dr. McKinney's Review of the General Assembly of 1866.

It is probably known to most of our readers that Dr. McKinney, formerly editor of the Presbyterian Banner, and now associate editor of the North-western Presbyterian, has been editing and publishing for two years past a Magazine called "The Family Treasure," largely devoted to the dissemination of sickly and sickening "love stories," such as are found in the poorest class of what are known as "religious novels." This month however, Dr. McKinney seems to have thrown out some of this kind of matter, and occupies a page or two in writing a Review of the Assembly of 1866. And so unfamiliar has he become with subjects of this kind; and judging his "love-sick" readers by himself, he finds it necessary to define what the General Assembly is, which he does in the following fashion:

"The annual meeting of a whole church in council to consider her doings, give thanks for her successes, rectify her errors, enter into new resolves, and devise plans for the enlarged usefulness to the good of mankind and the glory of the Lord, cannot but be an occasion of intense interest to her devoted members. This meeting of the Presbyterian Church is denominated the General Assembly. It occurred this year in St. Louis, Mo."

Now for whom could Dr. McKinney have intended this piece of writing. Does he find it necessary thus formally to introduce his Pennsylvania Presbyterian readers to the General Assembly; or does his Family Treasure only circulate amongst the less intelligent "factory boys and girls" in the New England States. It appears to us that the children of old-fashioned Pennsylvania Presbyterians, unless they have become so absorbed in these "love stories" as to have utterly forgotten all about it, must feel insulted by such an introduction to the General Assembly.

After this formal introduction, Dr. McKinney tells his readers that "a General Assembly is a very correct manifestation of the piety, intelligence, temper, integrity, social condition and religious spirit of the whole denomination." In this instance, we would say, so much the worse for the denomination. But not so Dr. McKinney. He next tells his readers that the Assembly paid less attention than usual to church-work. That its "efforts were disciplinary and penal, rather than sweetly attractive and edifying in faith and love." He says "The wanderer was visited with the rod of justice, more than commiserated, soothed and reclaimed by the sweetly constraining influence of forgiveness and love." And he takes special pains to inform his readers that this remark is made "historically, not condemnatory." Like Dr. Humphrey, "he is in for the discipline."

Dr. McKinney next discourses at length concerning the Louisville Presbytery and the Declaration and Testimony; and cites with apparent satisfaction, that Dr. D. V. McLean offered a resolution depriving the members of that Presbytery of their seats in the Assembly. And that after earnestly advocating the resolution called the "previous question" which was carried. The adoption of Dr. Gurley's paper by 197 to 37, he says produced a profound sensation of relief in the Assembly. He thinks that Dr. Gurley's paper, as a whole, was regarded as embracing substantial practicable rectitude, and that the Church will receive it as vindicating her honor.

The Re-union question is rather a ticklish one, and like Dr. Hodge he is non-committal on that point. He closes his Review of the Assembly very much like the Western Presbyterian, in stating that it was not the reckless and turbulent body that some people imagine, and was a great improvement upon that of 1865, and he looks for its successor to still further elevate the standard of ecclesiastical propriety. Poor Dr. McKinney. In the future we advise you to occupy all your space with the "love stories." They are better than your Reviews; at least so say the children.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth. How the Assembly Looks while in St. Louis, and How it Looks when at Home.

MR. EDITOR: What are the common people to think of the course of some of our most distinguished men, when they read such accounts of their sayings and doings, in and out of the Assembly at St. Louis, and their sayings and doings since the Assembly adjourned? "Truth" paints a portrait of one of our Kentucky divines which must certainly be unpleasant for that divine to gaze upon; and which he can not possibly, by all the logic in the world, make himself believe that any of his friends in Kentucky can admire.

It seems moreover that Dr. Joseph T. Smith has also been "sitting" for his likeness, which may yet be brought out with shades and tints which will very much disfigure the outward comeliness and placidness of that distinguished Baltimore divine.

It seems that Dr. Smith while in St. Louis, was denunciatory of the acts and spirit of the Assembly, and held council with Dr. Gurley as to the best method of checking the rampant radicalism of that majority of four-to-one. And yet Dr. Smith goes home to Baltimore and apologies for the "brutal conduct" of that body, and even goes so far as to claim for it an ordinary respectability. As for Dr. Gurley, he is reported to have said that as the majority was radical, he was with the majority. "How are the mighty fallen!" W. N.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth. Something More than Handkerchief Martyrdom—A Most Atrocious Murder.

To its long catalogue of outrages on the Church, the dominant party in Missouri have added one more atrocious than any that has preceded it. A minister of the gospel has been murdered in cold blood—brutally, cowardly murdered, by one of Drake and Strong's avenging angels, self-constituted executioners of an infamous law.

Let those who made themselves merry by suggestions of pocket handkerchief martyrdom during the Sessions of the Assembly in St. Louis, read the following written by one of the slain minister's parishioners, well known in this city as worthy of full credit, and then let them ponder how much their words and actions may have contributed to the result:

"DEAR FRIEND: Another man has fallen a martyr to intolerance. That man of God, the Rev. Samuel S. Headlee, of the St. Louis Conference, is no more. He was killed day before yesterday by a mob for preaching the Gospel. The circumstances are as follows: He had an appointment to preach, and organize the church at Pleasant View, a meeting house in Webster county, belonging to the M. E. Church South. On the 28th and 29th of July there had been threats that if he preached, he would never preach again. The day came, there was a number of men, women and children present to hear the preacher, they thought the threats were made to deter. There were also some twenty or more armed men present, headed by a member of the church North. Before the preacher came, these armed men seemed to be mad. They said he should not preach, and threatened to use violence if he attempted. The preacher went to them, and tried in a very mild way to persuade them to be cool and reasonable. He told them if he violated any law in preaching, to enforce the law, for he was willing to abide the consequences. The leader said he cared nothing for the law; 'there is my law,' pointing to his armed men. The preacher then asked him if he would let him preach if he and his friends went to their own land. They said they would not molest him. Mr. H. and his friends then started off. When they had gone about half a mile, some of the armed men came galloping along. One of them drew a revolver and shot Mr. H. three times. Two shots entered his body, and the third hit his arm. He died that night at ten o'clock, after giving his wife and friends his dying council, and, like Stephen, praying for his murderers, he fell asleep in Jesus."

One of our morning papers, the St. Louis Times, makes the following comment on the above:

"It is almost impossible to speak of the crime as its enormity deserves and be divested of passion. When we reflect that for no offence, baser—while complying with the very demands of his murderer, Mr. Headlee was shot like a dog, indignation swells every vein, and the hand which recites is stiffened for an avenging blow."

The party victim of party madness and malice, had in no way merited attack. He is represented to have been amiable to a fault, the benefactor of the poor, the sincere friend of all. If he had an enemy, his name or the cause of his enmity was not known. Even on the exciting question of the day, questions which affected him as a clergyman, it is not known that he ever expressed a public opinion, and yet a beast of the field was never more brutally shot down than he.

The narrative we give renders repetition unnecessary. It is by one of Mr. Headlee's parishioners, a man whose word is vouched for by Rev. Dr. McAnally, of this city. It bears upon its face the evidence of scrupulous truthfulness. It is a plain, unvarnished tale, and one that will affect the sympathies of every reader. We will add to it only by saying that the murdered man has been for twenty years a minister of the gospel, and that at the time of his death he occupied the honorably advanced position of a presiding elder in the Southern Methodist Church. It would insult the intelligence of the reader to inform him that the murderer is still unrepentant and at large. It is equally superfluous to declare that in all probability he will never be brought to justice so long as the present dominant party holds sway in Missouri. That party is the protector of murderers, in league with them, and the justifier of their crimes.

But we can aver that vengeance is sure, however long it may delay its coming. There is no truth that we may accept with confidence if we refuse to believe that God will avenge the blood of His children. It cries to Him from the ground. For every murder committed, for every outrage, punishment must inevitably be visited.

If the leading men of this party were not mad, they would see to it that such wrongs were not repeated, and that those which have occurred were speedily investigated and remedied. They are however, unfortunately for them and the country, stark mad. So long have the revolver and the knife been at their service, that they do not reflect upon the consequences which follow. When forbearance ceases, when men take upon themselves the task of avenging the wrongs which the laws are deaf to hear, it will be too late. Then will come regrets, but regrets will not avail. We adjure them if they desire peace, to see that peace is made possible. If not, upon them be the consequences, and upon them alone."

For the Free Christian Commonwealth. The Bible considered as cause to effect. English and French Philosophers contrasted.

PART TWO.

The devil did not mistake his man, when he chose Voltaire to best do an impossible work. He was a great and active agent of evil to a very large extent and through a long period of time. His empire of mischief was vast and various, and he did his work with an earnestness, fidelity, and fortitude, never surpassed. He had great forces at his command and he well knew how to manage them. He was able, crafty and spiteful. He was bland, humorous, or devilish, as the occasion required. He was vulgar, witty, or elegant, as the case demanded. He was, in a diabolical sense, all things to all men that he might win some; and if doing great things, be the measure of greatness, then this Frenchman was among the greatest of men.

But after all who thinks of equalling Voltaire with Bacon, Newton, Boyle, or Locke?

But in what does this inferiority consist? Not certainly in any great defect of natural endowments in comparison with those great Englishmen, but precisely in the utter destitution, on his part, of those great moral motives, principles, and attainments which imparted to them such beauty, symmetry, breadth, power, and majesty of character.

The English had their Bible and kept it side by side with all their science and all their investigations. They let its light stream all abroad and all around them, and found themselves treading all the more securely and luminously amid the mysteries of nature, while the Frenchman dawdled and stumbled amid the intense darkness of moral night. He reviled the Bible and cursed the Saviour. But their knowledge and character were no one-sided things, and it was this fatal deficiency, which stood as a cause to the lightness, the fickleness, the headiness, the haughtiness, the vanity, and bitter infidelity of Voltaire. Had he studied as reverently and as profoundly the pages of divine truth as they, what a character of moral and intellectual magnitude and excellence would he have left for the admiration of mankind? He might have been the Bacon or Locke of the French nation. But just as God turns the counsels of the wicked upside down, so what Voltaire did for human glory, which is the only divinity he worshipped, has turned into everlasting shame.

But it is right that the memory of the wicked should rot, and become a stench in the nostrils of nations. The applause of a corrupt and infidel nation was the vital breath of Voltaire. He toiled for it with stupendous power and assiduity. To live in the breath of others was all the immortality he knew. This was the centre around which the schemes and labors of his life over turned. Living for the world he never necessarily die with the world. The generation that knew him and honored him for his worthless labors and ambitious and versatile efforts after the transient glories of time, died and carried with them, the neglect which stung him to the quick, and the applause that bloated him into the creature of vanity that he was.

Poor man, he mistook the foam that was then floating upon the surface of Parisian society, for the permanent materials of his fame. He dreamed the dream, of all such laborious idlers, that the transient, shifting scene of things around him, was to be the daring vehicle which was to carry him safely and gloriously down the ages of time. He was purely of the earth earthy. He linked himself to no everlasting principles and practices of human welfare.

He left wholly out of view those eternal truths which survive and bless all generations of men in all quarters of the globe. Hence he has long since become a mere thing of history, curious and melancholy. He lives in none of the great principles of truth and righteousness. He has no bond of union with us and no character mingling in any aspirations after any coming spiritual glories. So that just as the generations of mankind advance in the lofty, the pure, and the good, so do they drop from their sympathy, and from all historic regard, all such men as the French philosophic infidels. They had nothing in common with Christianity, and hence it has left them behind to sink and be lost in the generation that contained them.

But with the English philosophers we still feel as if we were marching side by

side and hand in hand. These grand men, and lofty samples of christian life and power, were leagued with, and made themselves one with all the regenerated people of all coming time. Their names are embalmed in the history of christianity as well as in the histories of science, literature and philosophy.

But why is it that France displays an almost total destitution of that great moral and intellectual symmetry so common and so noble just across the channel? It is because France is not and has not been, for ages past, a Bible reading nation. Her great men and great scholars have known—but little of the Bible as a book of great moral and authoritative power. Hence their moral deficiencies and inferiority to the English savans, Pascal indeed was fairly a match for the English men and may justly be ranked among them. But Pascal was a most earnest student of the Bible. His moral dimensions were equal to his intellectual, and both mutually helped to construct that high character so remarkable in all such men for its strength and harmony. Such men live, because they live in the everlasting truths and principles which have made themselves and which must make all others of similar moral lives and sentiments.

The injury therefore, which a nation has inflicted upon its people by withholding the Bible from them is great beyond all weight and measure, all count and number. And to this end also we would say to all students eager for improvement and covetous of time, let no one fancy he has no time to spare for reading and studying the Bible. Let him well consider that his moral nature demands a due share of time to be sacredly and imperatively devoted to its interests. It cries out for knowledge and cultivation. Let him duly ponder also that to cheat his moral nature is suicidal to the highest and noblest half of his existence.

To this great object of human life, we would say to the student, drop the drudgery of daily study as the Sabbath ushers in its sacred hours. It will be a mental, as well as moral gain, to devote the day to its own proper and refreshing duties. Sabbath duties stir and strengthen the lagging powers of religious obligation and attention. A well spent Sabbath enlarges knowledge, enlightens faith and establishes that devotion which allies man with his Maker; and after a day thus spent, the mind returns with zest and refreshment to the studies of the Monday morning.

It is a low and absurd idea to treat the soul as a thing of merely hard dry intellect, to be wrought no where but amid the hard flint rocks of formal science and other formal things all the years of its earthly being. Let it indeed climb the heights and sound the depths of science, and let its range of knowledge on every hand be wide and various, yet let it all be mingled, ornamented and strengthened with large moral and religious acquisitions. Let the mental and the moral keep equal pace and let there be no gulf of separation between them. It is this alone which can make the noble form of a harmoniously developed scholar.

Therefore, to neglect religious knowledge, culture and duties is a fraud of the highest magnitude and of the deepest injury that a man can inflict upon himself. All one-sided studies make but one-sided men and one-sided thinking. This makes them ignorant and vainglorious as scholars, and false, defective, and crude as philosophers. It exposes them to those low and easy forms of infidelity whose impossible glory it is to ever putting the Bible and science in opposition to each other. These are your philosophers who erect their wigwags on the inhospitable deserts of error, and wonder why all mankind do not come and take their lessons there as from the only seminaries of truth.

Parties in the Presbyterian Church ten years ago.

DR. BRACKENRIDGE, in his review of the Assembly of 1855, presented the following view of parties, which it is interesting to compare with the state of parties now:

There remain in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church three types of opinion upon such things as there is any difference amongst us concerning. They occasionally appear with some distinctness: though we cannot avoid the belief that they are all drawing more nearly towards each other— and the points on which they are clearly distinguished are gradually diminishing, as the church advances on her high career, in the line of the immense force imparted to her in 1830-40. All three of these types appeared very obviously in the Assembly of 1855; and the most of what was peculiar in that Assembly, might perhaps be traced to this three-fold division of the body—and the various fluctuations of concert and antagonism of these three-fold elements.

There is that type of thorough Presbyterianism which rallied the earliest and most resolutely for the deliverance of the church, and which came in the progress of the conflict to be called derisively, the "Act and Testimony party;" the party against which Princeton set itself with such desperate hostility twenty years ago, and which after an interval of some years of more forbearing counsels, it appears inclined to distinguish again with peculiar opposition, under the name of "High Church Presbyterianism."

Of this type Dr. Thornwell, and we might perhaps add Dr. Krebs, and many other distinguished members of the Assembly of 1855, might be taken as specimens more or less complete. Next to this was that type of a Presbyterianism, which was not ready in 1831; was not ready in 1834; was getting ready in 1836; and being fully resolved in 1837, participated in all the struggles and triumphs of that eventful year—and in all that followed. Without the adhesion of this party, the church could not have been sound as early as 1837. In those days it delighted to call itself the "Virginia School," and to avouch, (we always thought with doubtful propriety,) the late Dr. Alexander as its head. Dr. Plumer, to whom we might add other leading members of the Assembly, (whose views of the true policy of the church, we consider far sounder than those of Dr. Plumer) might be taken as exponents of this type. Then, after both of the others, was that type of Presbyterianism—which was able barely to tolerate the Acts of the Assembly of 1837, after they were passed; which, driven to make election by the events of 1837 and '38, preferred the Old School, and stood for the church on the basis of the acts of 1837 and '38, and which has contended so sharply ever since, for all that was left in the church at that era, and against any particle of further progress in the way of reform. Dr. Boardman must be considered the leading exponent of this party in the Assembly of 1855. In old times, it delighted to be called the "Princeton Party;" and still, we believe, glories in that name. The church was saved without the co-operation of this party; nay, even against its strenuous opposition to most of the leading measures adopted to save it. But, after it was saved, this party seems to have supposed that it was extremely clear, that the church being saved in a manner very distasteful to it, could not get along without its supervision, and ought not to take any new step which it did not approve: in short, that the church having acted without its consent on that great occasion, ought to be satisfied with this act of disrespect, and forbear to incur any danger of the sort again.

It has appeared during all the interval from 1838 to 1855, that these three types, as we have before observed, have been gradually wearing into the one great type of the "High Church Presbyterian," if our brethren insist on that name for us—under that universal law which obliges the final development to correspond with the primal force. Weighing the sum of the Acts of the Assembly of 1855, we incline to the opinion that very few Assemblies during the past twenty years have established this fact more conclusively than this one. For ourselves, we have no sort of difficulty in accepting, with sincere cordiality, the second, and third of these three types, as honored Presbyterian brethren, with whom we cordially agree in most essential things; albeit we are ourselves called by them ultra of the first type. Nor have we the least objection to concede to those of the second and third types as much excess of place, honor and control as is at all compatible with the true progress of the church; leaving to them, as heretofore, a great over-share of all their hearts may desire—and prompt, ourselves, as heretofore, to wink as far as possible at the differences which separate us, and hold up their hands in all their attempts to do any thing which we can approve or aid, and keep a good conscience. Meantime, however, we must be tolerated in watching steadily their own progress towards a more thorough "High Church Presbyterianism;" aiding, now and then, their steps if they halt a little and crying out, even lustily, to them when we see them taking a route, which we know will carry them back to the place they set out from, and to which we are rather obstinately bent on not returning with them. It were well, however, if they could be content with somewhat less.

How to Have a Good Minister. Somewhere lately, I have seen this question: "How to have a good minister; how to make yours a good one; or if good how to make him better." In reply to it I would say:

1. Pray for him. "Brethren," says the apostle, "pray for us."—And if wishes were audible, such you would find is the earnest, the almost agonizing wish of the heart of every minister to his people. Pray, then, for your minister. He needs your prayers. His labors, responsibilities, anxieties, and perhaps his trials are great, and all for you. He is set to proclaim God's truth; and he needs your prayers, that he may do it successfully. With Paul he may say, "Pray for us, that the words of the Lord may have free course and be glorified." Beside, he prays for you; yes, and your families and children, and often with deep feeling, and perhaps with gushing tears, and therefore you should pray for him. Pray for him, and you will love him. "Pray for your enemy even," says an old proverb, "and you will soon love him." Much more if you pray for your minister—your best friend—you will love him. You will hear him too with interest, and hold him in high esteem, and be blessed by his ministry.

Action of the Church at Smithland, Ky.

At a meeting of the Officers and members of the Presbyterian Church at Smithland, Ky., on Saturday the 28th, of July, 1866, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted viz:

1st. Resolved, That fidelity to God—a conscientious regard to our ordination vows—a sincere profession of our faith in Christ and an earnest desire to maintain unimpaired the constitution and order of the Old School Presbyterian Church compel us to decline henceforth to sanction the sending of commissioners to the General Assembly and thereby refuse to recognize its unconstitutional acts.

2nd. Resolved, That we stand independent of the Assembly until we find such a body as existed in our country previous to the year 1861, or will not take the crown of Christ and place it on the head of Caesar—thus corrupting both Church and State.

3d. Resolved, That we highly approve of the course of our commissioners to the Late Assembly in St. Louis.

4th. Resolved, That we send delegates to the convention called to meet in St. Louis Mo. August 13th 1866.

5th. Resolved, That these proceedings be signed by the elders—published and a copy sent to the convention in August next.

JOSEPH WATTS, } Elders,
W. J. JENNINGS, }
T. J. DAVIS, }

2. Never speak of his faults. He stands to you in a most sacred and tender relation, somewhat like that of a parent to the child, or the wife to the husband; and what would you think of the husband or the child that should be found speaking to others of the faults of his wife or parent? What would you think of his honor, his manliness, his obedience to God? From your inmost soul you would loathe and despise him, and justly too. And so with you, if you speak evil of your minister. Besides, God by his apostle tells you to "know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." And all this you can never do if you speak against them. Shame on you, then; guilt on you, if you do it. On the contrary,

3. Delight to speak well of him. Not to himself, that is needless, but to others. Every one has some good qualities and so has he. Of every one you can say something good, and so you can of him. Do so, and it will lead others to do the same. It will extend his influence for good. It will aid to make him a blessing to yourself and to all about you.

4. Support him liberally. "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." This is God's command; and those that disobey it suffer. Many a church has cursed itself by being mean to its minister. Let not this curse be yours. Pay your minister liberally and punctually. Thus his mind will be at rest, free from anxiety, and entirely given to his appropriate work to laboring for your good.

5. Always meet him with kindness and affection. He is a man, and will appreciate and prize your sympathies. So far from his being above them, they will help to make him happy; and the want, the absence of them, will often send him to his study with the heart-ache—silent and uncomplaining it may be, but bleeding at the inmost soul. Would you shrink from inflicting a pang like this? Ever, then, meet him with a welcome smile, with a kind, encouraging, friendly word. It will warm his heart to a deep affection for yourself, will incite him to the greater effort for your good, and make him doubly willing to speak and be spent for you.

6. Call upon him. Not too often, for thus you may interrupt his studies, and waste his time; but at proper seasons. Some people never do this. They expect a minister to call and see them, but never think of calling to see him. Be not guilty of this neglect. Your minister, if a man of refined and sensitive feeling, will keenly feel it. An occasional and warm-hearted visit will cheer him, and aid him not a little to be useful. And now and then, as you visit him, take with you some little present—no matter for its value—that is of little consequence; but take it as a token of your kind remembrance and regard. Such courtesies will bind him to you with strong affection; and his affection it is all important for you to possess.

7. Ever be attentive to his teachings. If it is his to teach, it is yours to hear. Be then in your place every Sabbath—at every service—at every prayer meeting. Thus you will encourage his heart and strengthen his hands, and thus only can you appreciate his many labors. And not only hear, but what you hear apply to yourself. Obey it. He will have "no greater joy than to see you walking in the truth."

8. Remember these rules. Keep a copy of them. Place it where you can refer to it daily. Read them at least every week, and often ask wherein you have sinned against them. If you are prone to break them, then read them every day, as you go to your closet, and pray God by his Spirit to enable you to keep them.

Do all this—even attempt to do it—and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you will have a good minister. Observe these rules, and though by nature your minister may be far from what you would have him, still grace and kindness will make him a good one. Violate them—disregard them—and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you will have a poor minister indeed. Disregard them, and though in fact you have a most excellent minister, it will, to an absolute certainty, make him a poor one to you!

Presbyterian Index.

Action of the Church at Smithland, Ky. At a meeting of the Officers and members of the Presbyterian Church at Smithland, Ky., on Saturday the 28th, of July, 1866, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted viz:

1st. Resolved, That fidelity to God—a conscientious regard to our ordination vows—a sincere profession of our faith in Christ and an earnest desire to maintain unimpaired the constitution and order of the Old School Presbyterian Church compel us to decline henceforth to sanction the sending of commissioners to the General Assembly and thereby refuse to recognize its unconstitutional acts.

2nd. Resolved, That we stand independent of the Assembly until we find such a body as existed in our country previous to the year 1861, or will not take the crown of Christ and place it on the head of Caesar—thus corrupting both Church and State.

3d. Resolved, That we highly approve of the course of our commissioners to the Late Assembly in St. Louis.

4th. Resolved, That we send delegates to the convention called to meet in St. Louis Mo. August 13th 1866.

5th. Resolved, That these proceedings be signed by the elders—published and a copy sent to the convention in August next.

JOSEPH WATTS, } Elders,
W. J. JENNINGS, }
T. J. DAVIS, }

A thunder storm is thus described by David: "The clouds poured out water, the skies sent out a sound; thine arrows went also abroad."—Ps. 77: 11.

Free Christian Commonwealth

REV. STUART ROBINSON, Editor.

A. DAVIDSON & Co., Publishers.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1866.

Dr. Hodge on the General Assembly.

We have not shared in the disappointment of the large number of brethren who confidently expected Dr. Hodge to stand side by side with Dr. Boardman in manly and indignant protest against the action of the Assembly of 1866. For in view of Dr. Hodge's previous course; of his extremely radical political opinions; of his not very logical or consistent theories of the sphere of the church and the State; and of his oft exhibited infirmity of purpose, we saw no reason to expect that he would risk unseating himself at Princeton, by further exciting the truly Satanic spirit of our Presbyterian Jacobins, which, before the Assembly and in the Assembly, had been rapping out through certain wooden heads, its very ominous and significant curses at him.

It is but justice to Dr. Hodge to suggest that, for three very sufficient reasons, his brethren had no right to indulge expectations of his aid in resisting the Assembly of 1866.

In the first place, it was well known, that in connection with his many sound views of the nature and functions of the church, Dr. Hodge has held and uttered some of the most objectionable of the "Mayflower" heresies relative to the functions of the Church and the State respectively. He had asserted the right of Congress to send missionaries to teach religion in the West in case the church, with its more suitable agencies, had not anticipated Congress. He had asserted the right of any military force to impose upon Presbyteries and Synods the infamous Missouri military oaths, as a condition precedent to their sitting as Christ's courts. He had with truly child-like simplicity transplanted from the columns of the *New York Tribune* to his grave quarterly, the wildest of its Jacobinical vagaries, as first truths of political law. He had, with equally child-like credulity, accepted and re-issued the silly untruths of Northern fanaticism concerning the slavery conserving purpose and mission of the Southern church. He had, in face of his own ecclesiastical theory of church power, intimated what he now openly asserts—adopting and applying to the Assembly the dogma of our political Jacobins touching the civil constitution—

"That the General Assembly UNLESS EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED BY THE CONSTITUTION, can exercise its power to correct abuses or evils immediately in any part of the church." Thus making a burlesque of all constitutional government by construing the constitution as a mere veto power, to limit in certain specified cases an otherwise Omnipotent Ecclesiastical Parliament.

In the second place, Dr. Hodge's antecedents as a witness-bearer for the truth, did not justify the expectation that he would stand fast even by his protest against the binding obligation of the outrageous orders of 1865, in case a determined purpose were evinced on the part of the Radicals to enforce them. He protested in 1861, that "the General Assembly in thus deciding a political question and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the church, has violated the constitution of the church and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master," and yet in 1862, he asserted the right of the Assembly to pass the Breckinridge paper dictating a military policy to the government, demanding not only outward obedience, but the concurrence of the heart and conscience with the policy of the civil administration, and denouncing any who held different views as "faithless to all obligations, human and Divine."

He endorsed in every form the action of the Assembly of 1845, denouncing the dogma of the sinfulness of slavery as operating a dissolution of the church itself; and yet declared that the Stanley Matthews paper of 1864, with all its Jacobinical philanthropism, denouncing slavery as a "guilt" met the full concurrence of his mind, heart and conscience. What reason, therefore, to suppose that though pronouncing the orders of 1865 unjust, unconstitutional and of no binding force, he would stand by that opinion after a majority of four to one in the Assembly of 1866 had pronounced his opinion on that subject "one of the most fatal of heresies."

In the third place, it was well known that from the time of 1835-7-8, Princeton had always held majorities in far greater respect than martyrs; and communion with majorities far wiser than communion with martyrs. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, "the venerable Nestor," who spoke what he did know, had told us, in his review of the Assembly of 1855, concerning the course of Princeton in 1835-8.

"The Church was saved without the cooperation of this 'Princeton party,' nay even against its strenuous opposition to most of the leading measures adopted to save it. But after it was saved, this party seems to have supposed that the church being saved in a manner very distasteful to it, could not get along without its supervision, and ought not to take any new step which it did not approve; in short,

that the church having acted without its consent on that great occasion, ought to be satisfied with that act of disrespect and forbear to incur any charge of the sort again."

If Dr. Hodge, could in 1833, in face of his own protests against the "Act and Testimony" men, accept the leadership of that party in the majority, there was little reason to suppose that he would risk martyrdom in 1866 with the Declaration and Testimony men rather than accept the leadership of a majority of four to one with whose political sympathies he concurred, even though his ecclesiastical sympathies—now a minor question—were different.

We might multiply these illustrations were it worth while—to show that Dr. Hodge has taken just the course in 1866 which he might have been expected to take. Nay, if our limits permitted, it would be a matter of curious interest to show by analysis, that his very method of argument in this case is that pursued by him in all similar cases, viz: While establishing the right of the Assembly's wrong doing by adroit appeals to the "higher law" back of the constitution, still to keep up the appearance of great candor and wisdom by rather loose and feeble arguments against the expediency of the Assembly's wrong doing.

But while not at all surprised at the general tenor of Dr. Hodge's argument and conclusions, we must confess to some surprise at the method and spirit of his review of the Assembly.

First of all, we are struck with his very remarkable silence. In an article purporting to be a comprehensive history of such important doings of the Assembly as are of permanent interest, we find not a single word of the condemnation of Dr. Hodge's own heresy in declaring the acts of 1865 not binding—though one would suppose that so grave a charge against the leading theological professor of the church, would be a matter important enough to deserve at least a passing allusion. It will be remembered that the Assembly "approved" the memorial of the convention, which after denouncing the Declaration and Testimony, proceeds also to—

"Invite attention to the vast multitude of fatal heresies growing out of this subject—not the least of which is that which denies to the deliverances and injunctions of the Assembly during the past five years (upon slavery and rebellion), any binding force whatever. The action of the Supreme tribunal of our church is denounced as contrary to the constitution. * * * Those who thus revile the authority and disturb the harmony of the church should be required to desist from such revolutionary and schismatical conduct."

Now it seems to us remarkable that such denunciations as these aimed, beyond all question, at Dr. Hodge himself should be passed over by him in utter silence; unless indeed we are to accept a few allusions to similar "revolutionary and schismatical conduct" on the part of Dr. Thomas and Doctor West as intended to be an offset against, and a justification of Dr. Hodge's heresies and revolutionary conduct. On the Saviour's principle: "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone at the condemned Declaration and Testimony men. Or does he expect to buy his peace by his zealous assault upon the Declaration and Testimony; and have the public forget his own delinquencies in the hue and cry against its signers?"

Equally remarkable, in the second place, is Dr. Hodge's silence concerning the extraordinary outrage of the Assembly in creating bogus elders for the Walnut street church, in order to procure a judicial decision from a civil judge in favor of an insolent Radicalism which treated congregation, Presbytery and Synod alike with contempt in appealing to the Assembly.

In the third place, very remarkable is the silence of Dr. Hodge about so remarkable a case—the first in our history as a church—as the outrage of the expulsion of Mr. Ferguson for no other offense than having written to a journal what five hundred people had said concerning the ecclesiastical buffoonery of a political member of the house.

And in the fourth place, very remarkable is the silence of Dr. Hodge concerning so grave a matter as the insulting rejection of Dr. Boardman's protest. This silence concerning an outrage so gross and unpardonable as the calumnious charge of disrespectful language against one who as a gentleman towered in the Assembly as "Saul among the prophets," is the more significant because it naturally suggests the inquiry whether it arises from Dr. Hodge's unwillingness to stand by Dr. Boardman in his manly and indignant protests, or from sheer fear of the satanic Radicalism which spit its venom at Dr. Boardman in the Assembly.

And these other silences concerning the wrong doings of the Assembly are the more noteworthy from the fact that Dr. Hodge in conclusion makes such minute and elaborate search for something "to be thankful for" in the Assembly's proceedings. Though we are constrained to admit that even though "small favors thankfully received" should now be the rule, Dr. Hodge has succeeded badly in his search.

We cannot feel thankful with him "that the Assembly recognized the right of protest and free discussion," simply because in the first place the Assembly has no shadow of right to do any thing else; and in the second place because the Assembly did its best to crush both—as witness Dr. Boardman's protest—and Dr. McLean's call for the previous question. Nor for the same reasons can we accept thankfully as a favor with Dr. Hodge, "that the Assembly did not make its deliverances a condition of christian or ministerial communion." For unless on the same ground that we should be thankful that the Assembly did not steal our pocket book or our valise—as some scoundrel did on our way to the Assembly—we cannot understand why we should be thankful to the Assembly for our first rights as christian freemen.

We are sorry to find that Dr. Hodge's new political associations seem to have taught him the language of sycophantic courtiers as they crawl around the footstool of imperial power, and the trick of thanking tyrants for blessings which it is not theirs to confer.

Neither can we sympathize with Dr. Hodge's thankfulness in the third place, that the Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine of schism, seeing that the Assembly had no right to teach any other doctrine, and notoriously did not practice the scriptural doctrine even in its words it taught it. For the same reason we cannot sympathize with Dr. Hodge in his fourth reason for thankfulness, "that the Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine of slavery." For to say nothing of the fact that the Assembly has no business to teach anything else than scriptural doctrine, we can not for the life of us see that the Assembly teaches on this subject either the scriptural doctrine or what used to be the Princeton doctrine. As to Dr. Hodge's fifth and last ground of thankfulness that the Assembly "takes scriptural and liberal ground on the subject of christian union,"—for the same reasons assigned above we cannot enter into Dr. Hodge's emotions of gratitude; especially seeing that the Assembly was liberal far beyond the Scriptures to the New School, and narrow toward our Southern brethren beyond all limits of common sense or decency; to say nothing of the scriptures. But it is not amazing to find such a homily on gratitude as this coming from Princeton? Why did not Dr. Hodge, add as a sixth ground of thankfulness, that the Assembly was restrained from murdering Ferguson, or Boardman, or the Louisville commissioners?

But we find what we intended to be merely preliminary observations, have filled our present space. When we shall have published, as we intend, Dr. Hodge's argument on the right to exclude Louisville Presbytery, that our readers may hear both sides, we shall offer some remarks on his argument on that subject—which is the chief burden of his article—and also on his remarks upon the Declaration and Testimony.

Address to the Presbyterian People of Kentucky.

We have just received a pamphlet with this title, issued by brethren chiefly of West Lexington Presbytery, which beginning with the usual throwing out the tub to the Radical whale—that is, deprecating the spirit and mode of action of the Declaration and Testimony—begs the Radical brethren not to press upon them the issue by enforcing the Assembly's dissolving bull, and exhorts all to wait again for now the seventh time and see if the Assembly is in earnest. It is not in the style of Mr. Spilman's keen, lithe logic and unanswerable argument, but rather a homily for peace and quiet.

Feeling that we are no longer parties to this controversy—having reached our goal—and being disposed to exercise the largest charity toward our brethren, and to recognise their right to "the largest liberty" in the choice of their method of warfare against error and usurpation, we are indisposed to criticise either their own plan of the campaign, or their disapproval of the plan which we have executed. In the case of any other men than these excellent brethren of eastern and central Kentucky, we might be disposed to take offense at the quiet assumption, so habitual with them, of a certain superior equanimity of temper, moderation, wisdom and christian conservatism on their part which constitutes them natural umpires and mediators between the rash, violent, and bad tempered men of Danville on the one hand, and of Louisville on the other. For however it may be with Danville, we claim to be as moderate as truth permits us to be. But we know the men, and are persuaded that with them this sort of assumption is no hypocritical pretence, as with our former "celestial" but now "satanic" party of Louisville and Danville, but simply an excessive zeal for peace and harmony in men who truly hold the "like precious faith with us."

We have no responsibility for the style, spirit, or logic of the Declaration and Testimony beyond signing it by proxy. We can therefore without immodesty express our opinion as to that point. Nor do we hesitate to say that the whole ado about its terms and spirit is "more gammon" a hue and cry gotten up as Dr. Hodge would say "for a purpose" by men conscious of their inability to deny its statements or refute its reasonings; and from them retained second hand though the Church until by dint of repetition the story becomes generally current. Consistently enough those who deny its great principle may complain of its terms and spirit; but not those who concur in its general views of truth. The very subject matter of the paper is of such a nature that if its statements and doctrines are true its terms and spirit are not unduly harsh and denunciatory, or if harsh and denunciatory it must be because its statements and doctrines are not true. Nevertheless, if our brethren find it needful to make a convenience of us—under pressure of either a logical, rhetorical or strategic necessity—we will not quarrel with them about it.

Nor as to their policy of an appeal to the magnanimity and brotherly love of their Radical brethren; have we any right to find fault with them since we ourselves were simple enough to begin with that experiment. On our own personal and private responsibility we proposed to and urged upon the Radicals of Louisville Presbytery not to take advantage of the accident of our meeting immediately after the Assembly, to raise the question of executing the Assembly's infamous order; but, pleading the example of the Assembly itself which re-admitted signers of the Declaration and Testimony, to go on just as of old until the meeting of Synod and give us time to see what our brethren elsewhere in Kentucky would do. We pledged ourselves to join them in postponing all questions involving any important commitment of them till after Synod; even proposing to refer the Walnut street church outrage to the Synod without further action. We found however that even then the revolutionary agitation and division of the Presbytery was a foregone conclusion, evidently determined upon by a cabal of "middle men" before leaving St. Louis. Our Radical co-Presbyters were no longer free to entertain our appeal to reason, conscience, love of the peace of the Church, and old ties of friendship.

Of course therefore we find no fault with our brethren in central and eastern Kentucky for attempting the experiment which we ourselves made. That they will not succeed any better than we is in our judgment very certain. That they may lose the golden opportunity for making the issue with the Assembly on ground where the conscience and judgment of all fair-minded christian men will be with them and against the Assembly—and the ground on which the laws of the country can best protect their property interests, is in our judgment very probable.

The Assembly of 1867 is not likely to be less heretical in doctrine or fanatical in spirit than the Assembly of 1866. But we shall be greatly surprised if it shall not manifest far more shrewdness in so shaping the issues between its errors and the truths for which we contend as to leave far less ground, apparently, for our Fabian brethren in the border States to stand upon in opposition than they have at present.

We are sorry to observe that our brethren in central and eastern Kentucky seem to ignore the St. Louis conference, and manifest no desire for co-operation with brethren like minded with themselves. As the St. Louis conference was called, not in the interest of the Declaration and Testimony party but of all parties alike who have protested against the acts of the Assembly, it seems to us that a proper respect for their brethren of the same opinions should have induced the authors of this address at least to have noticed the call and assigned reasons for declining participation in the conference if they thought it unwise.

We repeat however that we have no quarrel with these brethren; but, so far as conscience allows, will render all the aid we can to their scheme of resistance to the usurpations of the Assembly. They have a bad opinion of our "extremes" and our impolitic rashness; we have a still worse opinion of their moderation and Fabianism; and results, so far, seem to justify our opinion. Nevertheless they are good and true men—sincere men—and, now-a-days, that rare virtue should "cover a multitude of sins."

A threat of summary discipline upon the "strategic" anti-re-union party in the Church.

In the Presbyter of August 1, Dr. Monfort reviews at length Dr. Humphrey's remarkable "strategic" statement in his speech before the "Assembly's Presbytery of Louisville," touching the committee appointed by the Assembly, with a view to a re-union of the Old and New School. In that speech Dr. Humphrey stated—and emphatically said that of his own personal knowledge he knew it to be true—that the members of the Assembly who were opposed to re-union, agreed to the appointment of that committee under the expectation of defeating the whole thing by that appointment. Concerning this remarkable statement Dr. Monfort says:

"The Church did not expect such a statement as this from Dr. H. H. He and his brother took part in the union communion of the Assemblies at St. Louis, and the fact was noted as one of the pleasant signs of the times. How will these remarks before the Louisville Presbytery surprise every man who was present at this communion? How can any man justify himself in voting for the resolutions of our Assembly for the purpose of defeating the measure?"

We do not ourselves see how Dr. Humphrey can reconcile such an act as this with fidelity to the cause of truth, or even honorable christian conduct; and remembering that Dr. Humphrey was acting in the name of Christ in casting this "strategic" vote, it appears to us, from our view of the nature of a court of Christ, as an actual trifling before God with sacred things. And it is a question in our minds whether the Presbytery to which he belongs, shall not be very derelict in its duty if it allow such an act of boasted duplicity to pass unrebuked. There is in that statement something fearful as illustrating to what an extent the present apostasy in the Church has gone, when such an act done in the name of Christ, can be spoken of as rather a cunning piece of "strategy."

Dr. Monfort intimates in pretty plain terms that the Assembly will not stand such a practicing of deception as Dr. Humphrey acknowledges himself and others to have been guilty of who thus voted with him. He says: "the probabilities amount almost to a certainty that the prevalence of the new 'dead letter' doctrine will postpone re-union until the Assembly shall have fully repudiated it as it did the schemes of reactionists at St. Louis." Yes, Dr. Humphrey is threatened with the Assembly's anathema, after the manner of its anathema upon the Louisville Presbytery and the signers of the Declaration and Testimony. Not that the cases are at all similar; though we apprehend Dr. Monfort's moral susceptibilities are too much blunted by "strategy" of various kinds to perceive any difference between them. They look to him alike simply because they both seem to him to retard the consummation of his re-union scheme. The difference however is this, the one case is an act of deception, the practice of which has been publicly stated and published to the world; the other is that, men acting in the fear of God, have boldly protested—and published their protest to the world—against just such conduct in the Church of Christ and by the courts of the Church, as that which Dr. Humphrey acknowledges himself to have been guilty of at the last Assembly.

But Dr. Humphrey will not be brought to discipline by the Assembly, neither will he be rebuked by his Presbytery; and he will escape the judgment of the Synod by taking advantage of the *ipso facto* dissolving bull of the Assembly of 1866. He will therefore remain *rectus in ecclesia*; and when the time comes for the marriage ceremony to be performed, we think it more than likely that Dr. E. P. Humphrey will be one of the officiating clergymen. Dr. Monfort says: "Our New School brethren are free from all such factions, and will hardly be willing to consummate a union until we are also free; and we can not ask them to do so." Dr. Humphrey promised to go with the Assembly even though it should be with tears. He will do it; and the rhetorical tears which he proposed to shed are the only ones which will bedim his eye. He will not disturb the harmony of the united household of Old and New School, though he may (simply from habit) again cast a "strategic" vote. It will not be necessary to call the "previous question" on Dr. Humphrey's case—he will submit without a protest.

Stonewall Jackson as a Soldier of the Cross.

In our last issue we cited largely from Dr. Dabney's biography of this remarkable man, in illustration of his spiritual history until the period of his settlement in the church in Lexington, Va. We proceed now to cite other extracts from the book—chiefly his own utterances in illustration of his rapid and wonderful progress in the Christian life; and especially his rapid growth in the experimental knowledge of that doctrine of God's sovereignty, which in his earlier Christian life was to him "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence."

Dr. Dabney well says of Jackson:—"Those who knew not whereof they affirmed, have loved to represent him as a sort of Puritan Independent, of the School of Cromwell, Harrison and Pride, assuming the functions of a preacher among his troops. No Christian could possibly be further from all such intrusion both in principle and temper."

"He has often been compared to Cromwell and to Havelock, but without justice in either case. The latter he certainly resembled, in energy, in directness, in bravery, and in the vigor of his faith; but his spiritual character was far more symmetrical, mellow and noble."

"To liken Jackson to Cromwell, is far more incorrect. In place of harboring Cromwell's selfish ambition, which (p. 113-114), under the veil of a religiousness that perhaps concealed it from himself, grew to the end, and fixed the foulest stain upon his memory, Jackson crucified the not ignoble thirst for glory which animated his youth, until his abnegation of self became as pure and magnanimous as that of Washington. Cromwell's religion was essentially fanatical; and, until it was chilled by an influence as malign as fanaticism itself—the lust of power, it was disorganizing. Every fibre of Jackson's being, as formed by nature and grace alike, was antagonistic to fanaticism and radicalism. He believed, indeed, in the glorious doctrines of providence and redemption, with an appropriating faith; he believed in his own spiritual life, and communion with God through His grace, and lived upon the Scripture promises; but he would never have mistaken the heated impulses of excitement for the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, to be asserted even beyond and against His own revealed word; nor would he have ever presumed on such a profane interpretation of His secret will, as to conclude that the victory of Dunbar was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With him profession always came short of the reality; he was incapable of affecting what he did not feel; and it would have been for him an impossibility to use speech with the diplomatic art of concealing, instead of expressing his true intent. His action, like Cromwell's, was always vigorous, and at the call of justice could be rigid. But his career could never have been marked by a massacre like that of Drogheda, or an execution like that of the King."

After his defeat of the five Federal Generals in succession in the Valley of Virginia, and when on his way by forced marches to Richmond, during an interval of rest on the Sabbath, we find him writing thus to Dr. White, his pastor: "I am afraid that our people are looking to the wrong source for help, and ascribing our successes to those to whom they are not due. If we fail to trust in God, and to give Him all the glory, our cause is ruined. Give to our friends at home due warning on this subject."

To another friend he wrote, Dec. 5, 1862, (eight days before the great battle of Fredericksburg):

"Whilst we were near Winchester, it pleased our ever merciful Heavenly Father to visit my command with the rich outpouring of His Spirit. There were probably more than one hundred inquiring the way of life in my old brigade. It appears to me that we may look for growing piety and many conversions in the army; for it is the subject of prayer. If so many prayers were offered for the blessing of God upon any other organization, would we not expect the Answerer of prayer to hear the petitions, and send a blessing?"

How his religion entered into his views of every day military life, will appear from the following letter to his wife in 1861:

"The troops have been divided into brigades, and the Virginia forces under General Johnston constitute the first brigade, of which I am in command. I am very thankful to our kind Heavenly Father, for having given me such a fine brigade. He does bless me beyond my expectations, and infinitely beyond my desert. I ought to be a devoted follower of the Redeemer."

And again in July, 1861, on the occasion of his promotion to the rank of Brigadier General:

"I have been officially informed of my promotion to be a Brigadier General of the Provisional Army of the Southern Confederacy. My promotion is beyond what I anticipated, as I only expected it to be in the volunteer forces of the State. One of the greatest (grounds) of desire for advancement, is the gratification it will give you, and serving my country more efficiently."

"Through the blessing of God I now have all that I ought to desire in the line of promotion. I would be very ungrateful if I were not contented, and exceedingly thankful to our kind Heavenly Father. May his blessing ever rest on you, my fervent prayer!"

The account of the first great battle of Manassas, given to his wife, in a letter of July 22, is in like spirit:

"Yesterday we fought a great battle, and gained a great victory, for which all the glory is due to God alone. Though under a heavy fire for several continuous hours, I only received one wound, the breaking of the largest finger of the left hand, but the doctor says the finger can be saved. My horse was wounded, but not killed. My coat got an ugly wound near the hip. My preservation was entirely due, as was the glorious victory, to our God, to whom be all the glory, honor, and praise. Whilst great credit is due to other parts of our gallant army, God made my brigade more instrumen-

tally fanatical; and, until it was chilled by an influence as malign as fanaticism itself—the lust of power, it was disorganizing. Every fibre of Jackson's being, as formed by nature and grace alike, was antagonistic to fanaticism and radicalism. He believed, indeed, in the glorious doctrines of providence and redemption, with an appropriating faith; he believed in his own spiritual life, and communion with God through His grace, and lived upon the Scripture promises; but he would never have mistaken the heated impulses of excitement for the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, to be asserted even beyond and against His own revealed word; nor would he have ever presumed on such a profane interpretation of His secret will, as to conclude that the victory of Dunbar was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With him profession always came short of the reality; he was incapable of affecting what he did not feel; and it would have been for him an impossibility to use speech with the diplomatic art of concealing, instead of expressing his true intent. His action, like Cromwell's, was always vigorous, and at the call of justice could be rigid. But his career could never have been marked by a massacre like that of Drogheda, or an execution like that of the King."

Jackon gives the following account of his own practical commentary on the exhortation—pray without ceasing:

"When we take our meals," said he, "then is the grace. When I take a draught of water, I always pause, as my palate receives the refreshment, to lift up my heart to God in thanks and prayer for the water of life. Whenever I drop a letter into the box at the post-office, I send a petition along with it, for God's blessing upon its mission and upon the person to whom it is sent. When I break the seal of a letter just received, I stop to pray to God that he may prepare me for its contents, and make it a messenger of good. When I go to my class-room, and await the arrangement of the cadets in their places, that is my time to intercede with God for them. And so of every other familiar act of the day."

"But," said his friend, "do you not often forget these seasons, coming so frequently?" "No," said he, "I have made the practice habitual to me; and I can no more forget it, than forget to drink when I am thirsty."

After his defeat of the five Federal Generals in succession in the Valley of Virginia, and when on his way by forced marches to Richmond, during an interval of rest on the Sabbath, we find him writing thus to Dr. White, his pastor: "I am afraid that our people are looking to the wrong source for help, and ascribing our successes to those to whom they are not due. If we fail to trust in God, and to give Him all the glory, our cause is ruined. Give to our friends at home due warning on this subject."

To another friend he wrote, Dec. 5, 1862, (eight days before the great battle of Fredericksburg):

"Whilst we were near Winchester, it pleased our ever merciful Heavenly Father to visit my command with the rich outpouring of His Spirit. There were probably more than one hundred inquiring the way of life in my old brigade. It appears to me that we may look for growing piety and many conversions in the army; for it is the subject of prayer. If so many prayers were offered for the blessing of God upon any other organization, would we not expect the Answerer of prayer to hear the petitions, and send a blessing?"

How his religion entered into his views of every day military life, will appear from the following letter to his wife in 1861:

"The troops have been divided into brigades, and the Virginia forces under General Johnston constitute the first brigade, of which I am in command. I am very thankful to our kind Heavenly Father, for having given me such a fine brigade. He does bless me beyond my expectations, and infinitely beyond my desert. I ought to be a devoted follower of the Redeemer."

And again in July, 1861, on the occasion of his promotion to the rank of Brigadier General:

"I have been officially informed of my promotion to be a Brigadier General of the Provisional Army of the Southern Confederacy. My promotion is beyond what I anticipated, as I only expected it to be in the volunteer forces of the State. One of the greatest (grounds) of desire for advancement, is the gratification it will give you, and serving my country more efficiently."

"Through the blessing of God I now have all that I ought to desire in the line of promotion. I would be very ungrateful if I were not contented, and exceedingly thankful to our kind Heavenly Father. May his blessing ever rest on you, my fervent prayer!"

The account of the first great battle of Manassas, given to his wife, in a letter of July 22, is in like spirit:

"Yesterday we fought a great battle, and gained a great victory, for which all the glory is due to God alone. Though under a heavy fire for several continuous hours, I only received one wound, the breaking of the largest finger of the left hand, but the doctor says the finger can be saved. My horse was wounded, but not killed. My coat got an ugly wound near the hip. My preservation was entirely due, as was the glorious victory, to our God, to whom be all the glory, honor, and praise. Whilst great credit is due to other parts of our gallant army, God made my brigade more instrumen-

tally fanatical; and, until it was chilled by an influence as malign as fanaticism itself—the lust of power, it was disorganizing. Every fibre of Jackson's being, as formed by nature and grace alike, was antagonistic to fanaticism and radicalism. He believed, indeed, in the glorious doctrines of providence and redemption, with an appropriating faith; he believed in his own spiritual life, and communion with God through His grace, and lived upon the Scripture promises; but he would never have mistaken the heated impulses of excitement for the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, to be asserted even beyond and against His own revealed word; nor would he have ever presumed on such a profane interpretation of His secret will, as to conclude that the victory of Dunbar was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With him profession always came short of the reality; he was incapable of affecting what he did not feel; and it would have been for him an impossibility to use speech with the diplomatic art of concealing, instead of expressing his true intent. His action, like Cromwell's, was always vigorous, and at the call of justice could be rigid. But his career could never have been marked by a massacre like that of Drogheda, or an execution like that of the King."

Jackon gives the following account of his own practical commentary on the exhortation—pray without ceasing:

"When we take our meals," said he, "then is the grace. When I take a draught of water, I always pause, as my palate receives the refreshment, to lift up my heart to God in thanks and prayer for the water of life. Whenever I drop a letter into the box at the post-office, I send a petition along with it, for God's blessing upon its mission and upon the person to whom it is sent. When I break the seal of a letter just received, I stop to pray to God that he may prepare me for its contents, and make it a messenger of good. When I go to my class-room, and await the arrangement of the cadets in their places, that is my time to intercede with God for them. And so of every other familiar act of the day."

"But," said his friend, "do you not often forget these seasons, coming so frequently?" "No," said he, "I have made the practice habitual to me; and I can no more forget it, than forget to drink when I am thirsty."

After his defeat of the five Federal Generals in succession in the Valley of Virginia, and when on his way by forced marches to Richmond, during an interval of rest on the Sabbath, we find him writing thus to Dr. White, his pastor: "I am afraid that our people are looking to the wrong source for help, and ascribing our successes to those to whom they are not due. If we fail to trust in God, and to give Him all the glory, our cause is ruined. Give to our friends at home due warning on this subject."

To another friend he wrote, Dec. 5, 1862, (eight days before the great battle of Fredericksburg):

"Whilst we were near Winchester, it pleased our ever merciful Heavenly Father to visit my command with the rich outpouring of His Spirit. There were probably more than one hundred inquiring the way of life in my old brigade. It appears to me that we may look for growing piety and many conversions in the army; for it is the subject of prayer. If so many prayers were offered for the blessing of God upon any other organization, would we not expect the Answerer of prayer to hear the petitions, and send a blessing?"

How his religion entered into his views of every day military life, will appear from the following letter to his wife in 1861:

"The troops have been divided into brigades, and the Virginia forces under General Johnston constitute the first brigade, of which I am in command. I am very thankful to our kind Heavenly Father, for having given me such a fine brigade. He does bless me beyond my expectations, and infinitely beyond my desert. I ought to be a devoted follower of the Redeemer."

And again in July, 1861, on the occasion of his promotion to the rank of Brigadier General:

"I have been officially informed of my promotion to be a Brigadier General of the Provisional Army of the Southern Confederacy. My promotion is beyond what I anticipated, as I only expected it to be in the volunteer forces of the State. One of the greatest (grounds) of desire for advancement, is the gratification it will give you, and serving my country more efficiently."

"Through the blessing of God I now have all that I ought to desire in the line of promotion. I would be very ungrateful if I were not contented, and exceedingly thankful to our kind Heavenly Father. May his blessing ever rest on you, my fervent prayer!"

The account of the first great battle of Manassas, given to his wife, in a letter of July 22, is in like spirit:

"Yesterday we fought a great battle, and gained a great victory, for which all the glory is due to God alone. Though under a heavy fire for several continuous hours, I only received one wound, the breaking of the largest finger of the left hand, but the doctor says the finger can be saved. My horse was wounded, but not killed. My coat got an ugly wound near the hip. My preservation was entirely due, as was the glorious victory, to our God, to whom be all the glory, honor, and praise. Whilst great credit is due to other parts of our gallant army, God made my brigade more instrumen-

tally fanatical; and, until it was chilled by an influence as malign as fanaticism itself—the lust of power, it was disorganizing. Every fibre of Jackson's being, as formed by nature and grace alike, was antagonistic to fanaticism and radicalism. He believed, indeed, in the glorious doctrines of providence and redemption, with an appropriating faith; he believed in his own spiritual life, and communion with God through His grace, and lived upon the Scripture promises; but he would never have mistaken the heated impulses of excitement for the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, to be asserted even beyond and against His own revealed word; nor would he have ever presumed on such a profane interpretation of His secret will, as to conclude that the victory of Dunbar was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With him profession always came short of the reality; he was incapable

Free Christian Commonwealth

Judge Kinkadee's Letter to Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D.

Nothing has surprised us more than the seeming want of interest which the mass of our more intelligent lawyers have taken in the great question of civil and religious liberty, which has been agitating both Church and State for several years past, unless it be the fact that some, from whom we expected better things, should have abandoned every principle of civil and religious liberty, of which the American people have been the boasted champions for a century past. We are gratified therefore in finding such a man as Judge Kinkadee, taking up the matters presented by Dr. Humphrey; and in so clear and forcible a manner exposing the fallacy of Dr. H's argument.

We think Judge Kinkadee unduly modest in regard to his ability in discussing ecclesiastical questions, and so we think our readers will judge after giving the letter a careful reading. And Dr. Humphrey himself we think must be of the same opinion, especially if he attempts a reply. The letter we clip from the Lexington Observer and Reporter.

To the Rev. E. P. Humphrey D. D.,

I have read with care your address before the Louisville Presbytery, delivered in Louisville on the 12th, of July, 1866. I have, as far as I could, divested my mind of all prejudice in the matters presented by you, and have attempted, with fairness and candor, to weigh all the facts and arguments, in the sincere desire to find out where the truth lay in this great controversy which so agitates the Church, especially in Kentucky. I must say that address, however able and eloquent, has not brought conviction nor satisfaction to my mind.

It may be viewed as presumption in a layman to venture any views or opinions upon matters which the clergy may regard as peculiarly in their province. I readily admit that such subjects are too high for me, who have not had the training nor bestowed on them the reflections to prepare one for such a discussion. I shall not, therefore, attempt it. But I may venture to propound the difficulties which have not been removed from my mind by this address, and to work as I may for myself a way through what leaves obscure and unsatisfactory to what seems to me to be the true principles which underlie these matters—that I as well as others who may accept my views when called upon to act in reference to them, may not be left afloat on vague and indefinite opinions, but may have a fixed and stable foundation upon which to plant ourselves.

It is not my purpose, then, to undertake a review of your address. All I propose is to give my views upon such propositions as I cannot accept, and this I do with great deference for your opinions, though my mind upon the reflections I have bestowed thereon has come to a different conclusion from yours. And upon other matters I wish, if possible, to get clear and distinct responses to certain propositions which are either passed over or stated but vaguely in your address.

You state three radical principles. The first all accept: "The Church and State are both of them ordinances of God." The second will not be disputed. The object and ends of the Church are to make men Christians here and prepare them for Heaven hereafter. It is a spiritual kingdom of which our Lord Jesus Christ is head. We should ever bear in mind those solemn words of his, "My Kingdom is not of this world." His saints on earth and in heaven constitute one host under his command.

The purposes of civil government are wholly different. It was ordained for men in a state of civil society, and looks to the preservation of their lives, their reputation and their property.

As to the third "radical principle," you state it substantially as follows: "Subjects which are purely secular in their nature belong exclusively to the State, such as tariffs, banks, &c., and any attempt on the part of the Church to determine them, ought to be resisted; so also subjects which are purely spiritual belong exclusively to the Church, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the Atonement, &c." But then you say, "There are subjects which may be called mixed, being in some of their aspects secular and in other aspects religious."—"Here," you say, "the rule is obvious. In mixed cases all those aspects which are secular belong to the State, and must be determined by a civil tribunal; all those aspects which are spiritual, to the Church, and must be turned over to the ecclesiastical courts."

Now let us examine the application of this doctrine and see if it be founded on the true principle. For if it is found that the Church in adopting it transgressed her province, and thus went beyond the teachings of scripture and the standards of the Church, then, indeed, it was a grievous error, and to it may possibly be traced all the woes which now afflict her.

You say of the late rebellion, "It was a mixed case. That in secular aspects it belonged to the Government." &c. But you say "The rebellion presented aspects purely moral and religious." You quote the scriptural injunction, but in often quoted, so full of wisdom, but in my opinion so often misunderstood: "Obey the powers that be, they are ordained of God." "Submit to lawful and constitutional authority." And then you lay down the duty of Christians not to obstruct or hinder the magistrate, but aid and assist him in his high office. You contend it was in this moral aspect of the question the Church was called upon to speak out.

Now it does seem to me that you have not been quite broad enough with this moral aspect of political questions in applying it only to what are called by you mixed cases, such as rebellion, &c. I would ask, is there not a moral and religious aspect in every political mat-

ter affecting the good order of society or the property or happiness of men in a civil state? Will not a Christian man be careful in forming his political opinions and regulating his civil conduct even touching such matters as tariffs, &c., lest by his wrongful act or opinions, wrong or oppression may be suffered by some portion of the community? He will give his aid that such laws shall be made that vice shall be punished and good men made safe and secure.

Now I would ask, is not every man morally and religiously bound to be careful that no improper motives, no selfishness, no malice, no ambition shall control him in forming his judgment and taking his stand on such questions? And is he not guilty of a great immorality and sin before God if he, from corrupt or improper motives, in such purely civil matters adopts wrong principles and aids in putting them into practical effect?

Here is clearly a high moral and religious duty. But I know you would be shocked to see the Church come down to soil her garments in such party conflicts as arise upon such questions as these. Each Christian man is left under his responsibility to God and his country upon his own conscience, choose his part and act for himself. If from improper motives he chooses and acts wrong, he sins against God, and God alone will judge him.

Nor can the church undertake to decide upon the constitution of the United States, and settle the question, under that instrument of the right of a State to secede from the Union. This, in my judgment, is a great political heresy; and he who attempts to put it into practical effect may be guilty of a great moral and religious wrong. But there are good men who have believed the doctrine. It is not vouchsafed the church to construe the Constitution of the United States and settle this political matter between us.

Then as to the moral aspect of this mixed question of the rebellion: Let us for a moment examine the principle you lay down and see where it will lead us. You say: "So long as no moral questions were involved in the contest, the church had nothing to do with it, but the moment that questions of right and wrong—of obedience to God—of immutable and eternal morality emerged from the crash of arms, then instantly the church was called to speak out." You continue: "Our church considered the rebellion wrong in point of morals, a sin against God, and for that reason it took jurisdiction of the case in that aspect of it."

Now I too thought the rebellion wrong. All who know me know how strong and fixed were my convictions on this subject. But I cannot believe it was in the province of the church as a body to pronounce whether the rebellion was wrong or right.

All admit that rebellions are sometimes right. The glorious revolution in England, which overthrew the bigoted and tyrannical James and established for that people Constitutional liberty under the great Prince of the house of Nassau, was surely a justifiable rebellion; nor will any one now deny that our Revolutionary Fathers were justified in their revolt from the oppressions of the mother country.

In the revolution of 1688, in England, Lord Macaulay tells us that "the greatest Anglican doctors of that age had maintained that no breach of law or contract, no excess of cruelty, rapacity or licentiousness on the part of the rightful King, could justify his people in withholding him by force. But my learned friend, I know, does not subscribe to this doctrine of 'passive obedience.'" Had he lived at that time, he would have been ranged on the side of Baxter, and Howe, and Bunyan, and William Kiffin; for his heart swells with him, as he refers to his own revolutionary fathers of the Presbyterian Church. With what eloquent and glowing language does he exhibit the action of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, on the Stamp Act in 1766; and how, in 1775, the Synod, under the leadership of John Witherspoon, took the side of the country against the King. We listen to the stirring sound of a trumpet vibrating upon our ears the names of Witherspoon, and Allison, and Tennent, and Miller, and Duffield, and James Waddell, and John Blair Smith, all of whom by words, and many of them by deeds, took their part in the great struggle in which their country was then involved.

Thus it is conceded that rebellion is sometimes right. Now I will ask you who is to settle the question? Is the church authorized to fix the precise point at which the oppression and tyranny of her government are so great, and the grievances so oppressive, that it becomes the duty of the people to resort to the terrible remedy of revolution? Can she say, "the grievances are not yet sufficient—you must submit?" Then again, "the grievances are now sufficient—gird on your swords and lift up the standard of revolt!"

It seems to me that the church, as a court of Jesus Christ, can settle no such question. She will pronounce the general scriptural injunction of obedience to the powers that be; "obey the laws as good citizens." But she has no warrant to pronounce when the time arises that resistance is justifiable. This, each member of her communion must, upon his own responsibility before God, determine for himself. I would not be understood as attempting to lessen the guilt of those who, without all sufficient grounds, rush headlong into rebellion. It is a fearful thing; and upon a Christian man a terrible responsibility. But it is a question the church cannot settle. He must determine it for himself.

This much then upon this general proposition. It was scarcely to have been expected that, during the existence of the great civil war, the deliverances of the courts of the churches North or South, should commend themselves to the sober judgment of mankind. But now is the time these questions shall be properly settled. It does seem to me that many of our present troubles are the result of the wrong view the Assembly took on these subjects. What strength and consideration the Episcopal Church acquired before the country for her course in reference to these matters? And what a glorious spectacle should we have had in the Old School Presbyterian Church, now that peace blesses the land, of brethren coming from the North and from the South embracing each other in cordial affection after these terrible years of separation, had the General Assembly during these years abstained from uttering her voice upon these most agitating questions; and in the spirit of charity in all her deliverances, drawn together the hearts of her people throughout this broad land, by sending words of kindness and of love, teaching all her children that they were bound to each other by a higher and holier tie than that which unites men in a civil state; and that though severed for a season by causes beyond their control, their hearts should be linked and united together as by a golden chain, vibrating from heart to heart, and reaching up to the throne of Jehovah.

It is clear, however, to me that it is not upon such questions as these that the church should divide; nor even upon the orders and deliverances of 1865. The Synod of Kentucky has pronounced some of them to be, in their judgment, unscriptural and unconstitutional. It is said that many of the friends of the Assembly have not only expressed their purpose to disregard these acts, but have actually refused to obey them. Now, I ask you, is not this clearly rebellion against the Assembly? Is it not defiance on the part of these brethren against its authority? Is it not, in short, nullification itself? In the language quoted by yourself, "who made these men a judge, or divider over the Assembly?"

But the Assembly seems to pass over this disobedience slightly, whilst it utters fearful thunders against those who shall disobey them in the matter of its action at St. Louis, in reference to the signers of the Declaration and Testimony. I was not in the Assembly at St. Louis. I will not then attempt to ascertain the influences which prompted that august body to the course they adopted in reference to the signers of that paper.

Upon these questions of church government I form my opinions with much hesitancy—and whilst I have strong convictions, I would gladly hear you, and if I am wrong, be put right by you. Your speech does not satisfy me.

Tell me if in your judgment the Assembly has the constitutional power to cite these men before them for trial as an original case? Is not the Assembly's power in such cases altogether revisory? Your speech might indicate that in your judgment the Assembly had original jurisdiction in such cases. Can this be your opinion? Ought not, must not the charges against these men be tried first in the Presbytery, and then go up to the higher courts by appeal? I can make nothing else out of our book. I need not cite the page—you are familiar with it. Tell me how you construe it. It seems to me it would not be more extraordinary for the Court of Appeals of Kentucky to assume original jurisdiction and try a man for murder.

If I am right in this, then the act citing these men being unconstitutional, is absolutely null and void; for you know an unconstitutional act is of no binding force. It is no act at all.

But you may tell me that though you and I may regard it as unconstitutional, still we are not to judge upon an act of the Assembly. Suppose a Presbytery believe it unconstitutional, and hence not binding, are they to execute it in a matter against their conscience? What would be their duty in such a case? Take for instance the Transylvania Presbytery. Suppose Brother Barnes, a signer of the Declaration and Testimony, asks for a seat in that Presbytery. He is, on all hands, considered a man of unexceptionable character, lovely and amiable. The act citing him to appear before the Assembly for trial, you conscientiously believe to be unconstitutional, null and void. That act directs you, on pain of the dissolution of your Presbytery, not to admit him to a seat. He has never been tried, and the citation unconstitutional in your judgment. In your judgment he has done nothing to call for such harsh usage. What should a Presbyter believe these things do? You answer, still obey the Assembly. That I may have more light in this great strain, I ask you what this means, (see confession of faith page 113), "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship, so that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commands out of conscience, is to destroy the liberty of conscience; and the requiring an implicit faith and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also." Ought not the same liberty of conscience be allowed in the construction of the Constitution of the Church as of the word of God? I ask you, in view of all this, what ought Presbyteries to do upon the application of such a brother to a seat in their Presbytery?

Again I ask you if in your judgment the attempt of the Assembly to make the act execute itself can possibly be efficacious? It seems to me as well might the Legislature of Kentucky attempt to pass a law that he who committed murder should forfeit all his estate, and direct the sheriff, upon the killing, to take possession of his property, and he should proceed to do it before a court and jury had passed upon the case to determine if indeed murder had been committed. Must there then not be a judgment pronounced upon the act of the Presbytery before a dissolution is effected?

And now, my dear sir, I have sought for light to guide me in the way of duty in the trying ordeal through which the Assembly is forcing the Church in Kentucky to pass. From the high personal regard I entertain for you, and my estimate of your ability and attainments, I shall always give to your opinions great consideration. Unused as I am to such investigations, I propound none of these views with a dogmatic confidence, and shall surely renounce them when I find they are wrong. W. B. KINKADEE.

Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in the General Assembly of 1858.

A friend clips for us from an old No. of the Southern Presbyterian, the following report of the proceedings of the fifth day. We submit them without comment, as a comment on the ideas of 1866.

FIFTH DAY.

TUESDAY MORNING, May 11, '58.

The committee on bills and overtures made sundry reports.

The subject of the proposed union between this Assembly and the United Synod of the South, was taken up. Dr. Van Rensselaer presented a resolution ordering a special committee of three to be appointed by the Assembly to confer with the United Synod.

Dr. Stanton called for the reading of the communications of the United Synod. He also called on Dr. Breckinridge for a paper on the subject, which he had promised some days since.

Dr. Breckinridge spoke at length, and was listened to with marked attention. We can give only some of the leading considerations which were urged.

He is one of the few ministers living who have fought through the war which began in 1831. While he would not vindicate every line and word uttered either by himself or by others during this long contest, yet he had nothing to retract or to apologize for, and he thanked God for the course which this Assembly has observed, and for the results.

The Presbyterian Church needs not to be enlarged by any union. Her great necessity is not extension, but homogeneity. His objection to union or compromise or conference, is founded not in dislike or in distrust, but in a great principle—that it is right and best for those not perfectly homogeneous to live apart. Better reasons than have yet been urged are needed to justify any step on the part of the Assembly towards any union but that which is required by Christian charity.

The proposals made to-day do not lay the foundation of any thing which it is wise for us to accept. There is offered no good basis for conference, or a compromise, or a union that shall advance the kingdom of Christ or of the General Assembly. The history of all similar attempts has but served to demonstrate their uselessness. I doubted the wisdom of the union at the commencement of the present century, with the Congregational church of New England. In 1837, the General Assembly solemnly declared that the union was unwise. The good resulting from it was not comparable in amount to the trouble, the care, the wrong.

Such is not the way of God's providence to prosper the union of any incongruous elements. Are this body and that body enough alike to be united? Does any man in his conscience believe that they should be one? "It is my deliberate judgment, in the sight of God, that there is no way for these two bodies to come together so as to strengthen each other hands."

The speaker himself drew up the minutes which cut off the three Synods of Western New York, but not that of the Western Reserve. He objected to it as too arbitrary and abrupt. In the minute he drew up, there was a hope distinctly expressed that they may return, when ever they shall be like minded with us.

He had personal knowledge that there are leading gentlemen in that body, who are not like-minded with us. He would never consent that the two bodies, as bodies, should be one. They may be better than we, or they may not—we may perhaps be even too sound—but put it as you will, we are unlike and are best apart.

The great defection of 1838 was none of our work. We did not off the four Synods already spoken of, but the great schism in our body was one of defection and renunciation. They withdrew from us, and we are willing to admit that they supposed they were in the line of duty, that they acted with principle and with a view to the glory of God. They hauled us before the tribunals, and sought to wring from us that which we could not grant. Yet our door has stood open all the while. It is now open.

Again and again have we reiterated the action of 1837—for twenty years have we invited them to return, on the one solitary condition that they be like-minded with us.

The hour having arrived for the order of the day, that order was, on motion, suspended, and Dr. Breckinridge was requested to proceed.

He said he had a minute to offer, which he thought embodied a true expression of this matter. As far as he was a judge, the propositions presented by them, define the reason why they seek this Conference, and they make their terms a *sine qua non*. That is right; but he did not believe in the truth of the propositions. On the terms proposed, he would not treat with the new father or his own brother. The New School Presbyterians have quarreled among themselves—the very event which he predicted twenty years ago. Cut his body into ten thousand pieces, and it was his deliberate conviction that every individual piece of him would protest.

The world has periodical turns of madness. The religious world is not exempt from the charge, and he supposed ourselves may be a little mad. Of this kind of moral epidemic, is the abolitionism which of late, has raged in the North, and produced the scenes of folly and absurdity which have astonished all sane and prudent men. But better thoughts are beginning to prevail. The conviction which has always swayed this Assembly, is gaining ground, that Ministers in their sacred capacity as Ministers, have nothing to do with matters apart from matters of salvation. Confining themselves to that, their peace flows onward like a river. Why, then, should they, without motive, break up this peace, and bring in elements of disturbance? To us of the South and the weaker division, it would be madness to enter into such treaties. The great pressure upon us, from without, is not on subjects of doctrine, but it is on the subject of abolitionism. In our character of a Church, the world can look to us for nothing but what strictly belongs to the way of salva-

tion. We of the South do not want the matter brought up. We do not want to discuss it here and now, nor at any other time or place, for three sufficient reasons: First. The question of subscription we settled twenty years ago, at the cost of schism; Second. The question of church power is a foregone question—our very existence depends upon maintaining our position upon it; Third. The question of the black race and their relation of servitude was settled seventy years since, in a multitude of ways, and with many conditions, but harmoniously; and we should not reopen it.

We are told that on these questions there is a division in that other body; but what possible significance can that circumstance have for us, any more than a similar division in the Methodist or any other church. I have no hatred towards them; I wish them good, and only good. I should sincerely grieve to see them wronged, and I should rejoice at witnessing their prosperity and happiness. Whatever their divisions, they are none of us, and our duty remains where it did before. We are to treat their parts as we treated their whole, having no duty to perform, growing out of their schism. Our door is open over to them when they are like-minded with us.

Dr. Breckinridge then read the minutes to which he had referred as follows:

In the matter of the proposals made at this General Assembly, on behalf of this United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, lately constituted in the State of Tennessee, out of a portion of those New School Presbyterians residing in several of the Southern States who have ceded from the denomination at and after the General Assembly of 1857, this Assembly makes the following deliverance:

1. Although the Committee appointed by the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church have not communicated to this General Assembly the official papers which that body is understood to have adopted, expressing of their own peculiar views and of the conditions, *sine qua non*, of the Conference proposed to this Assembly. Nevertheless, the contents of those papers being, in fact, known to this Assembly, we are not at liberty to act, as if we were ignorant of them. And in the judgment of this Assembly, those official papers do not afford a basis of Conference, upon which this Assembly, is able to see that there is any prospect of advancing the interest of Christ's kingdom in general, or those of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or those of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in particular.

2. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has always received, frankly and in Christian love, all churches, offices bearers, and private persons of all denominations making application for admission into her communion, upon the single condition that they are like-minded with herself. At this time ample provision is made in her existing Acts and Ordinances for the reception of all such into her communion, on terms and by methods precisely equivalent, and where it is possible, identical with those provided in regard to her own children raised in her own bosom. Seeing that it was in a voluntary secession from the Presbyterian Church, that the present difficulties of the United Synod of the Presbyterians had their origin, and that the door has always been open for the orderly return of such of those who left us, as were like-minded with us, it can hardly be unexpected that we decline any official conference, based on terms which appear to us to involve a condemnation of ourselves and a renunciation of the rich and peculiar favor of God upon us, in the very matters which led to their secession from our Church twenty years ago.

3. With reference to the recent secession in the New School body, this General Assembly does not see in that event, or in anything which has hitherto resulted from it, any call of providence for the Presbyterian Church to take any new steps whatever, either with the view of union or that of a closer intercourse than now exist, with either of the parts into which that body is now divided. The subjects upon which the whole New School body differed from us, at the period of their secession from us, and the subjects upon which the two very unequal portions of that body have recently separated from each other, are questions upon which we, as a denomination are at peace, and with regard to the whole, which we see no occasion to revise the understood and unalterable faith of our Church, or to enter fruitless conferences.

Succession in the Christian Church by Hereditary Descent.

A profession, then, of faith in Christ, and of obedience to him, not discredited by other traits of character, entitles an adult to the privileges of his church. And this is the first way of securing a succession of the covenanted seed, and of handing down their blessings to the end of time.

But the second and principal channel of conveyance is hereditary descent. The relations and benefits of the covenant are the birthright of every child born of parents who are themselves of "the seed." "I will establish," says God, "my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant." The substance of which, to repeat a preceding proposition, manifestly is, that as soon as a new individual is generated from this seed, he is within the covenant, and according to its tenor, God is his God. This is a characteristic of every public covenant which God has made with man. Take, for example, the covenants with Adam and with Noah. Every human creature comes into being under the full operation of both these covenants. In virtue of the one, he is an "heir of wrath;" and in virtue of the other, an heir of promise to the whole extent of the covenant. He has the faithfulness of God pledged to him, as one of Noah's covenanted seed, that the world shall not be drowned by a second deluge; nor visited by another calamity to exterminate his race.

Now, what imaginable reason can be assigned, why, in the covenant with his visible church, the uniform and consistent God should depart from his known rule of dispensation, and violate all the natural and moral analogies of his works and his government? It cannot be. There is no such violation; there is no such departure. Nor is it so much as pretended to have happened from Abraham till John the Baptist, or perhaps the day of Pentecost. But what was in the ministry of the Baptist? What in the ministry of Jesus Christ? What in

the effusion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, to destroy a radical principle of that very church which John, and Jesus, and the spirit of Jesus, were sent to bless and perfect? The notion is wild. And if, as has been already demonstrated, the covenant with Abraham and his seed was a covenant with the visible church—if this covenant has never been abrogated—if its relations and privileges, with an exception in favor of adults who desired to come in on the profession of their faith, were to be propagated in the line of natural generation, THEN, it follows, that the infant seed of persons who are under this covenant, are themselves parties to it; are themselves members of the church; and whatever privileges that infant seed had, at any given period in the history of the church, it must retain so long as the covenant is in force. But the covenant is in force at this moment; therefore, at this moment, the covenant privileges of the infant seed are in force. Visible membership is one of those privileges; therefore the infant seed of church members are also members of the church.

However many may corrupt and have corrupted the ordinance of God, so as to reject the visible means which he has appointed for perpetuating his church, yet as they cannot overstep his government, they are compelled to see the principle here contended for, operating with irresistible force, every hour before their eyes. For whether they will or not, the fact is, that the church of God, with an exception before mentioned, ever has been, and is now, propagated by hereditary descent. There is not, perhaps, in any nation under heaven that has been once christianized, and has not sinned away the gospel, a single Christian who has not received privileges as an inheritance from his fathers. Let us then beware how, in opposing infant church membership, we fight against a principle which is wrought into the essence of all God's constitutions respecting the human race. Mason's Works.

"He Giveth His Beloved Sleep."

"Of all the thoughts of God that are Borne inward unto souls afar, Along the Psalmist's music deep— Now tell me if that any is, For gift or grace, surpassing this— 'He giveth His beloved sleep!'"

Sleep soft, beloved, we sometimes say, But have no power to chase away Sad dreams, that through the eyelids creep, But never doleful dream again, Shall break the happy slumber, when 'He giveth His beloved sleep!'"

"O earth so full of dreary noises! O men, with wailing in your voices! O dervish gold, the water's heep! O strife, O cease that ever it fall, God makes a silence through you all, And 'giveth His beloved sleep!'"

"His dew drops mutely on the hill; His cloud above it saileth still, More softly than the dew it shed, And more than the dew it shed, Or cloud is doleful overhead, 'He giveth His beloved sleep!'"

"And Friends—dear friends—when it shall be That this low breath is gone from me— When round my bier ye come to weep: Let one most loving of you say, 'God's love for her must fall, 'He giveth His beloved sleep!'"

Hymnology in the Free Church of Scotland.

The subject of hymnology was, a few weeks ago, discussed by the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh with a view to the further introduction of the subject into the whole body. The relation of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland to hymnology is somewhat peculiar.

The Scotch version of the Psalms, which was made by an Englishman, is well known to have been adopted by the Established Church at the time of the Westminster Assembly, and it has been accepted by the other Churches which from time to time have broken off from the Establishment. To this was subsequently added about sixty hymns, or "paraphrases," as they are called, of others passages of the Scripture than those of the Psalms. In addition to these paraphrases there are four other hymns properly so called. These Psalms paraphrases and hymns being bound up for the most part, in all Bibles used in Scotland, have come to be the recognized hymn book in all churches and chapels, whether Established or Dissenting. One body of seceders, known as the "Relief," a branch since amalgamated with others into the United Presbyterian Church, from an early period adopted the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Isaac Watts; and that departure from Scotch practice paved the way for the introduction of a hymn-book, properly so called, which is now in general use in the United Presbyterian body. The Established Church and the Free Church still hold by the ancient version; and in the Free Church more especially there grew up a feeling of aversion towards the paraphrases, and a preference of the psalms as more truly expressive of the spirit of devotion.

And now it seems the tide is upon the turn, and there is a desire, not indeed to return to the old paraphrases, but to adopt some of those more spiritual hymns which mould so much the devotion of all the Evangelical Churches in England, whether in or out of the Establishment. That desire finds expression for the present in a very cautious manner. At the meeting of the Presbytery in question, Dr. Candlish proposed that the Presbytery should request the General Assembly to give their sanction for the use of a limited number of hymns "that have proved themselves to be according to the mind and taste and feeling of the people of God, and that may be said to have obtained, in a measure, manifestly the seal of the Divine Spirit." The number of the hymns to be sanctioned he proposed to be limited to twenty-five. A proposal to moderate did not, however, disarm hostility. Several members of the Presbytery saw in it an opening of the door to ritualism, and after a long debate the motion was only carried by a majority of twenty-five against twenty.—Evan Christendom.

For an old Christian to say to a young one, "Stand in my evidence," is like a man who has with difficulty climbed by a ladder to the top of a house, crying to some one at the bottom, "This is the place for a prospect—come up at a step."

For the Children.

From the Children's Friend.

The Prophet Samuel.

My young readers will find the interesting event which is represented to them in the cut, recorded in the first book of Samuel. I hope they will refer to their Bibles and read the whole chapter. Indeed, in order to understand the matter fully, they must become familiar with the history of the child Samuel, beginning with the first chapter. I am sure many of them are well versed in this part of Bible history already; and those who are not, I hope will read it over carefully at once.

The name Samuel means "asked of God." The good Hannah had earnestly prayed God to grant her this child. God heard her prayer and fulfilled the desire of her heart; and in order to make her little child a constant memorial of God's goodness and faithfulness in answering her prayer, she called him Samuel.

Hannah and her devoted husband Elkanah, were both very pious persons; and according to the requirements of the Jewish worship, this man, "and all his house, went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice, and his vow," at Shiloh the place where the tabernacle worship was celebrated. It was at this place that Hannah had made her earnest prayer for this child; and now, when Samuel was given unto her, she dedicated him to the service of God forever, even unto the Lord at the tabernacle so long as he should live, and then to become a servant and a worshipper in the house of God in heaven. Hence she remained at home until she had weaned the little child.

When Samuel was old enough to dispense with his mother's care, she and her husband took him up at the annual festival, to present him before the Lord. Along with him, they took up "three bullocks and one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine, and brought him unto the house of the Lord in Shiloh; and the child was young. And they slew a bullock, and brought the child to Eli." This venerable man was the chief priest of the Jews; and was also the Judge of the land of Israel at that time. His mother sang a beautiful psalm of thanksgiving on this occasion; and then having accomplished the worship of God in their offerings and vows, his parents returned to Ramah to their own house. "And the child did minister to the Lord before Eli, the priest," being girded with a linen ephod. Moreover his mother made him a little cake, and brought it to him from year to year, when she came up with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice.

The venerable priest Eli, was a very pious and good man; but his sons, on whom devolved much of the service of the tabernacle, were very wicked young men, called in the Bible, "sons of Belial." They did many things which were displeasing and oppressive to the people, the result of which, was, that "man abhorred the offering of the Lord."

Now although Eli was a good man himself, he was not as faithful as he ought to have been in restraining and correcting his sons. True he remonstrated with them and reproved them. But he ought, as a father and as a priest of God to have forbid and prevented their misconduct, but he did not. This sin eventually brought down on him and his house a most dreadful punishment.

But while these wicked young men were making themselves hated by the people, the child Samuel grew on, and was in favor both with the Lord, and also with men. Eli was very fond of him, and took good care of him, "and the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli."

The time was now coming when the Lord meant to visit with a righteous judgment, those wicked young men who profaned the priest's office, thereby sinning against God and oppressing his people. God had already warned Eli of his punishment by the word of a prophet; but there was no evidence of reformation in his sons, nor did he exert his authority to prevent their wickedness. Now, once more, he sends a message to him through the child Samuel.

Eli and Samuel had both lain down at night to sleep, when the Lord called Samuel. The child immediately answered, and went to Eli, supposing it was he who called him. Finding his mistake he returned to his couch. "Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed to him." The Lord called a second time, when Eli perceived it was God who was speaking to the child.

"Therefore Eli said unto Samuel, Go, lie down; and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak Lord; for thy servant heareth. So Samuel went, and lay down in his place. And the Lord came, and called as at other times, Samuel! Samuel! Then Samuel answered, 'Speak, for thy servant heareth.' Whereupon, the Lord informed Samuel of the overthrow of the house of Eli, telling him that now the time was come, when he would both begin and finish all he had already threatened. This was the first revelation made to Samuel, and its subsequent fulfillment made the people of Israel to understand that he was established to be a prophet of God.

I cannot follow the history of the prophet Samuel. Except the life of our Saviour, there is scarcely any portion of the Bible history more interesting than the events which occurred during his life, with the most of which he was connected; and all of which are recorded in the books which bear his name. My little readers, I hope, will turn to their Bibles and read the account for themselves. B.

WHEN God makes our cross a little heavier, He means that we shall come to Him for added strength to carry it. We must draw closer to the Lord our strength and live more simply upon Him. He has fullness without limit, and of His fullness shall we receive.

SANCTIFIED afflictions are spiritual promotions.